UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,881	08/01/2006	Yasushi Yagi	2006_1186A	3846
	7590 01/27/201 , LIND & PONACK, I		EXAM	INER
1030 15th Street, N.W.,			SMITH, PHILIP ROBERT	
Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
_			3739	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/27/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/587,881	YAGI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	PHILIP R. SMITH	3739				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 A</u>	igust 2006					
	action is non-final.					
'=		coaution as to the morit	o io			
•	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
closed in accordance with the practice under £	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pending in the application.						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
· · · · ·	· <u> </u>					
o) Claim(s) 1-10 are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
TT/ The oath of declaration is objected to by the Ex	anniner. Note the attached Office	Action of format 10-132	- .			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some color None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te				

Application/Control Number: 10/587,881 Page 2

Art Unit: 3739

DETAILED ACTION

Election of Species Requirement

[01] This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of endoscope:

- [01a] A probe-type endoscope, as in claim(s) 17.
- [01b] A capsule-type endoscope, as in claim(s) 18.
- [01c] The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species of endoscope for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Currently, claim(s) 1-16 are generic with respect to the species of endoscope.

- [02] There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.
- [03] Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Application/Control Number: 10/587,881

Art Unit: 3739

[04] The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Page 3

- [05] Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.
- [06] Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Second Election of Species Requirement

- [07] This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of image generation unit:
 - [07a] Having a motion estimation unit comprising a corresponding point detection unit, as in claim(s) 2-3,8.
 - [07b] Having a motion estimation unit comprising a camera motion correction unit responsive to a segmentation movement by a sine wave, as in claim(s) 2,4-5,8.

Application/Control Number: 10/587,881

Page 4

Art Unit: 3739

- [07c] Having a motion estimation unit comprising a camera motion correction unit responsive to a peristalsis movement by movement of a soliton, as in claim(s) 2,4,6,8.
- [07d] Having a motion estimation unit comprising a camera motion correction unit responsive to a segmentation movement by a sine wave, as in claim(s) 2,4,7-8.
- [07e] Having a feature region cutout unit wherein the predetermined energy is determined based on differences in pixel value, as in claim(s) 9-10,15.
- [07f] Having a feature region cutout unit wherein the predetermined energy is determined based on differences in area between triangular patches, as in claim(s) 9,11,15.
- [07g] Having a feature region cutout unit wherein the predetermined energy is determined based on between a coordinate obtained by correcting and a coordinate of a great circle, as in claim(s) 9,12,15.
- [07h] Having a feature region cutout unit wherein the predetermined energy is determined based on a degree of deviation of a plurality of control points, in a second image taken by said camera, which respectively correspond to a plurality of control points selected from a first image taken by said camera, as in claim(s) 9,13,15.
- [07i] Having a feature region cutout unit wherein the predetermined energy is determined based on a degree of deviation between a plurality of control points selected from a first image taken by said camera and a plurality of control points, in a second image taken by said camera, which respectively correspond to the plurality of control points selected from the first image, as in claim(s) 9,14-15.
- [07j] The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not

Application/Control Number: 10/587,881

Art Unit: 3739

obvious variants of each other based on the current record. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species of image generation unit for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim(s) 1 & 16-18 are generic with respect to the image generation unit.

Page 5

- [08] There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.
- [09] Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.
- [10] The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37

Application/Control Number: 10/587,881 Page 6

Art Unit: 3739

CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

- [11] Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.
- [12] Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Telephonic Election

[13] A telephone call was made to Mr. Charles Watts (202) 721-8200 on January 25, 2010, to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Conclusion

- [14] Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHILIP R. SMITH whose telephone number is (571)272-6087 and whose email address is philip.smith@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached between 9:00am and 5:00pm.
- [15] If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272 4764.
- [16] Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application
 Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained
 from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is

Application/Control Number: 10/587,881 Page 7

Art Unit: 3739

available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Philip R Smith/

Examiner, Art Unit 3739